

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
10/616,623	LU ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Phallaka Kik	2825	

Paper No. 20060126

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to the Examiner's indication that claims 2,6,7,16,20 have minor informalities problems, Applicant's Representative counter-proposes to amend claims 1-3,5-9,15-17,20 to remove the problems raised by the Examiner and better clarify Applicant's invention, which the Examiner agreed. Accordingly, Applicant's Representative authorizes the Examiner to amend the claims as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment. As per claims 10-14, the Examiner also indicated that since Applicant did not point out the supposed errors in the Examiner's restriction requirement in the Office Action mailed on 10/19/2005, Applicant's election with traverse has been treated as an election without traverse, which Applicant's Representative agrees and also authorizes the Examiner to cancel claims 10-14 as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment. Additionally, Applicant's Representative also authorizes the Examiner to amend the abstract and the summary of invention portion of the specification as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment, to also reflect the changes in the independent claims 1 and 15, which better summarizes Applicant's invention as given in the specification (see especially Applicant's specification, page 12 as pointed out by Applicant's Representative), in which the common marked cell is used as the reference point from which the clock uncertainty is calculated.